



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

*A Mexican-Aryan Comparative Vocabulary.* The Radicals of the Mexican or Nauatl Language with Their Cognates in the Aryan Languages of the Old World, chiefly Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and Germanic. By T. S. DENISON, A.M., Author of *Mexican in Aryan Phonology*, and *The Primitive Aryans of America*. Chicago: T. S. Denison, Publisher, 1909.

In the introduction the author explains why his discovery, already made known in his previous publications, that "Mexican is an Aryan language closely akin to Sanskrit and Avestan but more primitive than either, in fact Aryan of the proethnic period," has not received appropriate recognition among scholars or in the daily press. To one who is convinced that "the proofs are just as good that Mexican is Aryan as they are that English is Aryan" the reason can only be that "radically new ideas make way slowly" and that "incredulous silence or caviling opposition is what great discoveries have invariably encountered." A colleague of the reviewer's is quoted to the effect that philologists should either accept the work or try to refute it, and the author rules out the excuse of "too busy" by stating that "any comparative philologist may decide in an hour's time as to the value of the work, and it is not necessary to understand Mexican." With this encouragement, and in view of the strong plea for attention from a man of evidently serious purpose, the reviewer has perused this vocabulary and reached the conclusion that the author's thesis is just as irrefutable as the demonstration of kinship of all languages of the earth which was published some years ago by the Italian Trombetti, and which was not denied exploitation in the Italian press. One is disappointed at the small percentage of really striking coincidences, such as might rank with the famous equations of Lycian *lada* 'woman' with English *lady*, or Mexican *teotl* 'god' with Greek  $\theta\epsilon\sigma$  (our author prefers to connect *teotl* with Latin *deus*, etc.). The great majority of the comparisons are so far-fetched that they fail even to excite "hostile surprise" or to add anything to the statistics of coincidence.

C. D. BUCK

---

*The Acropolis of Athens.* By MARTIN L. D'OOGHE. New York: Macmillan, 1908. pp. xx+405+v. \$4.00 net.

This book, "a labor of love" and the fruit of years of painstaking study, is the most exhaustive and interesting account that has yet been published of the Acropolis and its monuments, and will be of lasting service. The author says in his preface that the book "is an attempt to give a summary of the most important contributions to this history [of

the Acropolis] and to state the results of personal study of this site and of the ruins upon it." In the matter of choice between a topographical and a chronological order of treatment, "the historical has generally been given the preference," and the chapters discuss (1) the natural features of the Acropolis, (2) the earliest historic period, (3) from the Persian destruction to the age of Pericles, (4) the age of Pericles, (5) the buildings of the southern slope, (6) the Hellenistic and Roman period, and (7) from the close of the Roman period to the present time. The body of the text is followed by a few pages of notes and three appendices containing (1) a statement of the sources, excerpts from Frazer's translation of Pausanias' account of the Acropolis, and a bibliography, (2) a critical résumé of Professor White's article on the Pelargicum, and (3) a discussion of the old Athena Temple. Professor D'Ooge has read to good effect the voluminous literature concerning the Acropolis, but the book is more than a compilation, though in places one might wish for a fuller statement of the author's own views rather than a balancing of the divergent opinions of others.

To discuss or even to summarize Mr. D'Ooge's conclusions touching the numerous moot points would carry one beyond present limits. This volume reminds us how much must yet be done, but in the supposedly unsettled state of Athenian topography it is refreshing to consider how much after all is certain and how nearly scholars are in agreement upon most questions. At least it is pleasanter to be optimistic.

Views opposed to his own Mr. D'Ooge treats with all due respect, but it is a bit amusing to read (p. 239): "It is perhaps worth the while to state briefly the view of those scholars" who believe in a raised stage! A few valuable studies, such as Furtwängler's reconstruction of the pediments of the earliest Athena temple and Petersen's latest investigation of the Opisthodomus, might have been mentioned. But nearly everything available up to the date of publication, including Dr. Dörpfeld's redating of the early Parthenon and his theory of an unfinished Erechtheum, has been presented, the latter perhaps too fully, considering its uncertainty.

Errors are ever unavoidable. The statement (p. 32) that "the main entrance [of the Acropolis] at the time of building the Propylaea must have been a little northwest of the present entrance" is scarcely correct; nor is it likely that the metopes of the Parthenon (p. 124) were "dropped from above into the grooves." The head of an ephebus (Fig. 46) is wrongly called "bronze" (p. 106), apparently from a misunderstanding of Gardner's *Greek Sculpture*, p. 189. Dörpfeld's last investigations of the great theater were in 1895, not 1886 (p. 231). The caryatid substituted for the one removed by Lord Elgin is not a "plaster cast" (p. 325; cf. p. 201). The occurrence of a lacuna in Pausanias in the Athena Ergane passage is hardly to be affirmed (p. 288) without qualification. The

"secret passageway" (p. 30) and the "cave of Aglauros" (p. 10) are not to be proved from Herodotus and Pausanias (cf. note 11, p. 332, and Robert, *Pausanias als Schriftsteller*, p. 317); but doubtless opinions must differ on this point.

The illustrations of the book are abundant, and their selection is far better than their printing. The "makeready" leaves something to be desired, and the "photogravures" appear to a novice like good half-tones rather than intaglio prints—unless the meaning of "photogravures" has changed. Fig. 9 is repeated as Fig. 86, and not all the cuts are attributed to the proper source. Fig. 29 is wrongly inscribed, "Foundation Walls of the Parthenon." Some of the plans might better have been redrawn to fit the theories of the text. The use of plans from Jahn-Michaelis has occasionally led the author into unwarranted explanations. For example, on the back of Plan I, *c*, *f*, and *h* are misleading, while *m* is wrong (cf. p. 12, Figs. 129 and 130, and *Amer. Jour. Arch.* VIII, 69). The folding plan of the Acropolis, Plan VII (from Middleton's supplement to *Jour. Hellen. Studies*), is quoted as VI on p. 82 and elsewhere. The primary, rather than secondary, sources for cuts (e.g., Fig. 130), would have been more helpful.

The English of the text is sometimes open to cavil, as, p. 111: "to rebuild the great temple in honor of the patron-goddess of the state that had been burnt by the barbarians;" p. 112: "demurred to the large outlay;" p. 120: "lies plumb;" p. 151: "impersonations of nature;" and p. 280: "twilled petticoats," which is a trifle modern for archaeological use.

The spelling of proper names—"Nicodemus" along with "Neaichmos" in the same paragraph (p. 35), "Pelargicon or Pelasicum" (p. 24), "Herceios" (p. 16), and the like—is little short of capricious. A thousand pities that English-speaking scholars cannot agree in this matter!

But these are but "flies in the precious ointment." The book is excellent.

CHARLES H. WELLER

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

---

*Catalogue of Bronzes, etc., in Field Museum of Natural History Reproduced from Originals in the National Museum of Naples.* By F. B. TARBELL. Field Museum of Natural History, Publication 130; Anthropological Series, Vol. VII, No. 3. Chicago, 1909. Pp. 99–144; Pls. xxxvi–cxvii.

The Field Museum possesses a collection of about three hundred reproductions of objects, almost exclusively bronze, the originals of which are in the museum at Naples. These originals are household utensils and furniture, for the most part of Roman date, though a few are earlier. They were found, with few exceptions, at Herculaneum,